

NORTHGATE STAKEHOLDERS GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

**North Seattle Community College
ED 2843A in the Dr. Peter Ku Education Building
Tuesday, April 26, 2005, 4:00 pm – 6:30 pm**

The Northgate Stakeholders Group (Group) held its fifteenth meeting at North Seattle Community College on Tuesday, April 26, 2005 from 4:00 pm to 6:30 pm. The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Approve meeting summary #14;
- Review and discuss results of additional studies on traffic and parking related to a possible cinema tenant for the Lorig development proposal for South Lot, and, if appropriate, provide additional advice;
- Review and discuss design of the 3rd Ave. NE extension;
- Hear themes from calls with Stakeholders and discuss future Group work and schedule.

Welcome

Ron LaFayette, Chair, convened the meeting at 4:00 pm and briefly reviewed the agenda. He invited members of the public who wanted to speak during the public comment period to sign up.

Northgate Status Report

Jackie Kirn of the Office of Policy and Management reviewed a status report on events, projects and activities in the Northgate area in the following categories (available as a handout):

- Northgate Mall Expansion
 - The Northeast Design Review Board made recommendations on April 18.
 - The Design Review Board recommended two departures that have been discussed by the Group: a departure from the 10' landscaped walkway provisions and a departure from the full requirement for compact parking spaces.
 - The Design Review Board also recommended three master use permit (MUP) conditions which are likely to be attached as conditions to the MUP: one regarding the landscaping between the sidewalk and the driveway; one about re-designing the service gates along the west façade to better match the scale of the adjacent buildings; and one to remove the driveway from the parking garage to the south driveway, which would cross the pedestrian sidewalk and to relocate the driveway as necessary.
 - Ms. Kirn said that public notice signs were in place on the site and that Mark Troxel of the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) had notified the Group via email that the official SEPA public comment period was underway. She said that the comment period would end on April 27th unless extended by written request for an additional two weeks.

- Northgate Commons Schedule
 - Ms. Kirn noted that the Group would talk at the meeting about the cinema proposal and the updated traffic/parking analysis. She said that Lorig was on track to submit its MUP application on May 16th and that DPD would make a recommendation on the issues of the MUP and the contract rezone during the summer. She explained that the DPD recommendation would be followed by the hearing examiner process and hearing, after which it would go to the City Council. She said the calendar would be updated with more detail and that it would be linked to the Group's website.
- 3rd Ave. NE Street Extension
 - Ms. Kirn said that the key issue under discussion between the City of Seattle and Metro/King County was about options for transit-vehicle layover. She explained that the County had suggested locating the layover area on the new 3rd Ave. NE. She said that the City planned to look at the bigger picture before decisions are made.
 - Ms. Kirn noted that the County and City Council would approve an interlocal agreement about funding and other issues related to the 3rd Ave. NE project. She said that the City would provide \$500,000 in funding and that the County would make contributions to the Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP).
- Comprehensive Plan Amendments for 2005
 - Ms. Kirn said that the Seattle City Council Urban Planning and Development Committee, at its April 27 meeting, would consider and decide which proposed amendments would be given further consideration in the 2005 Seattle Comprehensive Plan amendment process. The full Council is scheduled to take up the issue on May 2, including the proposals to extend the Northgate Urban Center and to amend regulations to promote housing and mixed-use development in the urban core.

In response to a Stakeholder question concerning the big picture for the Comprehensive Plan amendments, Ms. Kirn responded that it was an annual process. This initial step was to decide which proposed amendments would be carried forward for discussion. She said that the final decision would be made by the end of the year, in December, and that a preliminary decision would be made by September, with opportunities for public input. Ms. Kirn asked Norm Schwab from Council Central Staff to provide a more definitive answer.

Mr. Schwab explained that a process was being laid out for the Council to direct DPD staff to analyze the proposed amendments and provide recommendations. He said that, at that point, it would be a resource issue to decide where staff should put their energies in looking at the amendments. Ms. Kirn said that City staff would report the outcome of the April 27 decision and would then lay out a more detailed timeline.

Ms. Kirn clarified that the Council would not act on the amendments on April 27, just decide which issues DPD staff should analyze further. She said that public review and the Council process would precede the vote on the amendments, which would occur later in the year. In response to a Stakeholder question, Ms. Kirn confirmed that any substance or implication for Northgate would emerge after the DPD staff work finished researching the amendments and that the research results would be published.

Ms. Kirn noted that Stakeholders Shawn Oleson and Jan Brucker had attended a sustainability workshop on April 18 for the South Lot that had focused on the needs of seniors, natural drainage options, sustainability and green building design, and universal design. She said that a write-up would be sent to Stakeholders and the public.

Meeting Summary

The Chair asked the Group for comments on the draft summary of the March 29 meeting. There were no comments, and the summary was approved as drafted.

Announcements

The Chair called on Bruce Kieser, facilities director of North Seattle Community College (NSCC), to speak briefly about NSCC's Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP) and the planning process that is expected to take about two years.

Mr. Kieser said that NSCC was one of about 10-12 major institutions in Seattle, such as major hospitals, universities, and community colleges, that had received special planning status from the City. He explained that major institutions do master planning for a ten-year time frame.

Mr. Kieser noted that, as a major institution, NSCC could pre-request development approval. In other words, NSCC could get entitlements from City Council that would allow any development that was included in the MIMP to go forward during the ten-year planning horizon.

Because of the long planning horizon, Mr. Kieser said that NSCC especially valued neighborhood and Stakeholder involvement in the planning process. He emphasized that NSCC was pleased to be entering the MIMP process while the Group was still active. He also noted that NSCC wanted to begin its planning process while good development was underway east of the freeway, in the hope that the College could keep the momentum in the planning process going.

Mr. Kieser reported that Schacht/Aslani Architects had been selected to work on the MIMP. Walter Schacht said that he was glad to be involved in the NSCC planning process and reiterated Mr. Kieser's point that it was beneficial for NSCC to undertake planning while there was development moving forward in the Northgate area.

Mr. Schacht listed the subconsultants that would be working with his firm, including:

- Buck & Gordon LLP
- TSI (Transportation Solutions, Inc.)
- EconoAssociates
- Magnusson Klemencic Associates

Question: What are the elements that will be studied for the Master Plan?

Response (Bruce Kieser): We will start by defining what we want to be for the next ten years, or longer. We'll start with strategic planning including looking at what programs we want, what corresponding facilities we need, traffic, the environment, everything.

Question: Is this in lieu of an EIS? What is the public process?

Response (Walter Schacht): In Seattle, development is ordinarily regulated, in terms of land use, through master use permits (MUPs). MUPs are typically tied to building permits and may include an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that disappears at the end of the building permit. For major institutions, where long-range planning is critical, the land use rights extend beyond a building permit. Right now, the college has a MIMP and has development rights for another five years or more. An EIS was developed for it. The college is being proactive because of all of the activity around Northgate right now, to allow coordination with Northgate development. Whether or not an EIS is needed will be determined by the scope of the plan that the College produces. It will depend on any changes to the MIMP. If anything happens that involves growth or any kind of development, an EIS would be needed.

Question: What is the time frame for your process? Can we get on a notice list?

Response (Walter Schacht): We'll spend the summer and probably early fall engaged in educational facilities programming, which will let us know whether the current development strategy is sufficient or if modifications are needed. If modifications are needed, the College would form an advisory council, an EIS would be prepared, and there would be public notice. The first thing is for the College to establish its long-term needs and the community's expectations.

Review and Discussion of Design for 3rd Ave. NE Extension

The Chair said that the 3rd Ave. NE Extension agenda item would be moved ahead in the schedule because Katherine Casseday, Traffic Engineer for the Seattle Department of Transportation, had to leave early.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, pointed out that that this was the Stakeholders' first opportunity to provide input on the 3rd Ave. NE extension, and that there would be more opportunities. She encouraged the Stakeholders to discuss those issues that were uppermost in their minds so that Ms. Casseday could consider them in her decision-making.

Ms. Kirn introduced Ms. Casseday, noting that it was her responsibility to make decisions on the configuration of streets and their operation. She said that Ms. Casseday was considering the whole range of issues that had been before the stakeholders: mall build-out, the new parking structure, the Lorig proposal, the cinema, the design of 3rd Ave. NE, the configuration of NE 103rd St., and on-street parking. Ms. Kirn explained that Ms. Casseday would ultimately make her decisions with Stakeholder input and the benefit of the CTIP analysis. Ms. Kirn said that she was glad Ms. Casseday had the opportunity to meet the Stakeholders and to hear the issues important to them.

Ms. Casseday explained that her job was to balance the many issues with respect to traffic: moving vehicles, moving people, and keeping it as comfortable as possible. She acknowledged that there were many Northgate projects on her plate and emphasized her intention to listen to the Northgate Stakeholders and consider their issues as she decided what was best for 3rd Ave. NE and overall access.

Comment: I'm dismayed that bus layover is to be a big issue on 3rd Ave. NE. I know that buses must go somewhere, but we never anticipated it would be there.

Response (Katherine Casseday): I understand that. We're meeting as staff to look at on-street options away from 3rd Ave. NE, and we're meeting with Metro/King County to understand what their needs are and what the options are.

Question: I haven't seen the latest design. What kind of signalization is planned on 3rd Ave. NE?

Response (Katherine Casseday): The current design is to signalize the intersection of NE 103rd St. at 3rd Ave. NE. There are no plans right now to signalize 3rd Ave. NE at NE 100th St. As traffic may grow into the future, that may become necessary.

Question: What is the current thinking on the width of 3rd Ave. NE and will there be a change in the width of NE 103rd St.?

Response (Katherine Casseday): Currently three lanes are proposed for 3rd Ave. NE with parking on both sides and a 73 foot right of way. The curb-to-curb distance is 49 feet with 12 foot sidewalks on both sides. That includes parking, two travel lanes, and a turn lane. Through the CTIP process, we are working to confirm the roadway cross-section for NE 103rd St. We have not concluded that analysis, so I have no answer to that right now.

Response (Jackie Kirn): Ron Posthuma is not here yet. When we made this same report to an informal group last week, he said that the County is not in agreement with the width of the westernmost parking lane, because the County thinks that area might be used for a bus layover. So, we will be evaluating layover needs throughout the area.

Question: Is it true that there will be no change to 3rd Ave. NE south of 100th?

Response (Katherine Casseday): That's true.

The Chair noted that the Group had discussed 3rd Ave. NE often in previous meetings, and he asked the facilitators to pull out those comments and send them to Ms. Casseday and to Yoshiko Ii at the King County Department of Transportation. Ms. Shorett agreed to do so.

The Chair thanked Ms. Casseday for attending the meeting.

Traffic and Parking Related to a Possible Cinema Tenant for the Lorig Development Proposal and Update on the ERA Care Design

The Chair recalled that Lorig had made a commitment to the stakeholders at the last meeting to bring the results of the parking and traffic studies that were focused on a cinema tenant to the Group. He called on David Harrison to facilitate the review and discussion of the additional traffic and parking studies related to the proposed cinema tenant.

Mr. Harrison reminded the Group that its advice on the Lorig/ERA Care proposal had been passed on March 29 and that its advice had intentionally recognized the possibility of changes in the tenant mix. Mr. Harrison read a section of the advice, highlighting where the stakeholders had retained for themselves further opportunities to review the impact of any changes on

parking, traffic, and transparency. Today's presentations, he said, created a significant additional opportunity to review those three issues.

He noted that it was not anticipated that the Group would formally re-open the advice, but that doing so was an option. He said that an informal discussion was anticipated that would give the stakeholders the information they needed before the summer.

Mr. Harrison then called on Steve Bollinger and Richard Loo of Lorig and Jeff Riebman of ERA Care to give their presentations. He asked the Group to hold questions and discussion until the end of the Lorig/ERA Care presentation, except for clarifying questions.

Lorig Presentation

Steve Bollinger of Lorig & Associates told the Group that while there were many changes to discuss in relation to the cinema tenant, much of the proposal remained the same. He said Lorig understood that because the cinema concept was proposed late in the process, the Group would not be as involved as in other aspects of the proposal. He said that Lorig would try to keep the Stakeholders up to date on the project, noting that Lorig would meet with the Group after submitting the MUP and contract rezone request on May 16th.

Mr. Bollinger said that he would quickly describe what the program included; Richard Loo would speak about design; ERA Care would present about their southeast parcel; and Tom Noguchi from Mirai Associates would discuss the traffic and parking demand analysis.

Mr. Bollinger said that the program currently included 255 mixed-income apartment units and 110 units for sale, so a sizeable residential community was still planned. In addition, about 50,000 square feet of retail was anticipated, including about 30,000 square feet in restaurants and related entertainment and about 20,000 square feet in service retail. He said that ERA Care had 128 senior care residential units on its southeast parcel.

In response to a request for a definition of “mixed-income,” Mr. Bollinger replied that Lorig was seeking the property tax exemption which requires that 30% of the units be at 70% or less of median income. Additionally, he said Lorig had been exploring what is called 60% or below type housing, but that little funding was available for that purpose at the present time. He noted that, at a minimum, the project would have a spread from median income to about 70% of median income.

Mr. Bollinger reported that Lorig was working on streetscape issues. He said that the cinema partner had been cooperative in placing the cinema on the second and third floors, so that the ground level could be predominantly retail, as the Group had wanted.

Design

Mr. Loo, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, showed the Lorig site layout and focused on only the things that had changed. He said that the footprint of the cinema building on the northwest corner had hardly changed.

Mr. Loo said that the major change was thinking through traffic circulation for the cinema, where people would be dropped off, because movement of people in a cinema was important. He described the basic circulation concept, which included a one-way entry from NE 103rd St. and a drop-off zone in front of the cinema. He said that the lobby was anticipated to be on the inside face of the courtyard, which was where people would be dropped off. He said a valet parking station would be located there and that vehicles would drive down from there into the parking garage.

Mr. Loo said that a major change was that previously there had been no direct connection into the parking garage; it had been necessary to go out in the street. Mr. Loo noted that the access to parking garage was advantageous because Lorig was working with King County on park and ride arrangements, and the design would allow easy access for park and ride users.

Mr. Loo noted that with the inclusion of a cinema, more parking would be needed than had previously been anticipated. Instead of 440 underground stalls, Mr. Loo said that the plan was to have 370 stalls on Level 1 and 490 stalls on Level 2, for a total of 850 underground parking stalls. Adding the remaining 60 stalls on the surface, 910 parking stalls were planned on the Lorig property, plus or minus ten.

Mr. Loo described the planned parking, saying that Level 1 would have almost direct access off of 3rd Ave. NE and NE 103rd St., and indicated the area that would be shared with the park and ride. He said there was also a shared area on Level 2, for a total of about 400 stalls to be shared with Metro/King County. He said there were details still to be determined. Mr. Loo explained that the parking for use by residents and retail would not be blocked off from the rest of the parking. He pointed to a separate parking area that would be dedicated to the condominium residents.

Mr. Loo said that the cinema company representative had creative designs for the facility. The cinema's main lobby had been placed on the inside for several reasons, including preventing people from being dropped off on NE 103rd St. and blocking traffic. He pointed out the main lobby on the corner facing Northgate Mall, which had high ceilings and windows that would allow sunlight in and make cinema activity visible to the street. Mr. Loo described the cinema as a beacon at night.

Mr. Loo explained that retail and restaurants were planned at the sidewalk level, but that down the slope to 5th Ave. NE, the transparency details would depend on the type of tenants. He mentioned the possibility of locating entrances to residential lobbies in that area. On 3rd Ave. NE, Mr. Loo described having retail and restaurants face the channel. He noted that the cinema had a higher floor-to-floor ratio than previously considered, but that the building footprint remained the same. He also said that cinemas tend to have external corridors and that Lorig hoped to create some transparency with those. Mr. Loo showed several different views of the proposed development. He then turned the presentation over to Jeff Reibman of Weber + Thompson.

ERA Care Presentation

Mr. Reibman pointed out the following changes that had been made to the ERA Care facility design in response to Stakeholder comments and Design Review Board requests:

- The turnaround feature of the ERA Care facility had been removed. He said the intent was to have only one curb cut, which would provide access to the garage.
- On the entrance level, the entrance had been moved away from the corner, and a gallery café was planned for the corner instead.
- The auditorium now had direct access to the outside. A plaza had been incorporated on that corner that had direct public access.
- The building had been set back to create a colonnade and a protected plaza out front. Benches and planters are planned which will add visual interest for pedestrians.
- The lobby was moved to the quieter NE 100th St. and the split entry-way concept had been discarded.
- On the north side the parking ramp was behind the blank wall. Parts of the dining terrace are visible from that view.
- On the major pedestrian street, a lot of transparency has been incorporated into the design.

Mr. Reibman emphasized that the design was intended to make the corners more interesting. At the entrance off of NE 100th St., for example, he showed a canopy coming out to the street and a tower feature that was intended to complement the visual interest at the corner.

With respect to loading zones, Mr. Riebman noted that there was a city requirement for a loading zone on-site but said that ERA Care hoped to get a contract rezone allowing it off-site. He pointed out where on 5th Ave. NE that ERA Care hoped to locate a truck loading zone, near the garage entrance. He said there would be on-street parking and a bus stop on NE 100th St.

Mr. Reibman said they hoped to provide another loading zone at the main entrance on NE 100th St. as on-street parking, such that a truck could pull in, be unloaded to the core of the building, and pull away without disrupting the sidewalk with curb cuts. They hoped to have it signed as a three-minute loading zone.

He also showed the grade change along 5th Ave. NE. Residential units are planned along that side until they near street level, at which point public transparent functions, like the auditorium, would begin. Because of the grade change, he said, some window wells would go below street level to maintain some transparency. He said they had also added some roof elements at the corners to add interest.

He said the design had achieved almost total burial for the level that exited to the garden, except for a 25-foot wide swath, and that there would be light wells and the living room would lead out to the garden terrace.

He presented more views of the planned ERA Care facility, highlighting a meeting room that would be available for rental.

Question: About the loading zone that you mentioned, when people are moving in, which probably happens more than at an average apartment complex, wouldn't they need more time or better access to do that?

Response (Jeff Reibman): ERA Care facilities do not actually have higher turnover rates than other housing. When people move into these facilities, they typically use professional movers who are very fast. The delivery schedule at ERA Care facilities is pretty sparse. We're collecting data from the ERA Care facilities which we will provide along with the traffic studies in the contract rezone request.

Question: When people come to visit relatives, would they park inside? Is there extra parking underneath?

Response (Mr. Reibman): We expect to have enough visitor parking inside, especially after the initial few months when tenants typically have their cars. After a few months, people tend to get rid of their cars, but some people keep their parking spaces for use by visitors. The three-minute load zone to serve the lobby would be used to pick people up and drop them off. There is some existing on-street parking and we hope that there will be more. We'll see how that goes as the street plan develops.

Comment: Three minutes doesn't sound like very much time, especially for senior citizens.

Response (Jeff Reibman): No one will bother them after three minutes if they are actively loading. It's just to keep people from stopping there for a long time.

Comment: Speaking from experience, three minutes is not very long for seniors. We're dealing with ages 85 and up so there is high turnover. Unless you require it, not everybody moves with professional movers. It's families moving them in, so parking is a concern. It'd be nice if you could have another area more on site rather than on the street.

Response (David Harrison): Let's flag that as one of the issues the Stakeholders would like to discuss.

Response (Jeff Reibman): I've pulled the building back already and I can continue to push on this. One of the problems, if we put that loading zone on the street, is that we then disrupt the sidewalk. That is the trade-off.

Response (David Harrison): We will come back to this specific issue.

Transportation Planning for Northgate Commons

Mr. Harrison introduced Tom Noguchi of Mirai Associates who spoke about the traffic impacts of Lorig's Northgate Commons project and the updated parking analysis. Referring to a transportation planning handout, Mr. Noguchi explained that the first step in analyzing transportation impacts was to identify the uses the project might have. He noted that Northgate Commons would have residential, retail, restaurant, cinema, and senior housing uses. Mr. Noguchi said that their analysis assumed that 3rd Ave. NE would be completed and that there would be a signal at NE 103rd St. The analysis also assumed that Metro/King County would use up to 400 parking stalls for park and ride.

Mr. Noguchi described the statistical analysis that had been done to estimate vehicle trip generation at all times of the day and week. He explained that the total trips generated would be fewer for a mixed-use development compared to operating all of the uses independently. For

example, people might have dinner at one of the restaurants in the Northgate Commons and then walk to the cinema, resulting in only one trip for two uses. Mr. Noguchi said that the total trips generated had been adjusted by 20 percent to account for this factor.

Mr. Noguchi emphasized that he had made conservative assumptions in adjusting the estimate of trip generation. He noted that some people would walk to the development rather than drive. As shown on the handout, he said they estimated that about 800 trips would be generated during peak hours. He noted that the cinema's peak trip generation would occur on Friday evenings, after the typical rush hour.

Comment: On the handout, I don't understand the intersection of 5th Ave. NE and NE 103rd St. You added traffic but you got fewer delays.

Response (Tom Noguchi): Yes. It's because currently there is wasted "green time" (when no cars are moving at an intersection, even though the light is green). We want to operate the signals more efficiently. Ms. Casseday will work hard to make the Northgate signals operate more efficiently.

Question: Have you factored in back and forth trips between the project and Northgate Mall?

Response (Tom Noguchi): Yes. When adding up the existing trips for 2004, we included Northgate Mall and community center traffic. We also assumed that a new parking garage would exist at 3rd Ave. NE and NE 103rd St. on Northgate Mall property.

Question: Numbers can say anything. How did you gather these numbers and from what geographic area?

Response (Tom Noguchi): We generated them from multiple sites. We can generally find a reasonable approximation for the potential uses in this development. Since there is no building yet, we can't be 100% right, but we have high confidence in these numbers.

Question: So, you didn't consider the traffic we already have?

Response (Tom Noguchi): We counted traffic around the mall in 2004. We have the most up-to-date traffic count. We then added our estimates for the Northgate Mall expansion, the community center, and for Northgate Commons.

Mr. Noguchi continued his presentation with a description of the routes that people would use to travel to and from the Northgate Commons. Diagrams of the routes were included in the handout. Mr. Noguchi described the analysis of driveways and intersections that was used to determine levels of service. He explained that "level of service" was defined by the length of traffic delays. He pointed out that most of the estimated increases in delays due to Northgate Commons would be minor.

He then discussed the assumptions that had been used in the parking analysis (listed in the handout), which included the suitability of using a predictive model, the level of cinema occupancy, adjustments made for traffic conditions specific to mixed-use development, a parking supply of 900+ spaces at Northgate Commons, and the availability of additional parking under a shared park and ride agreement with Metro/King County. Mr. Noguchi commented that peak parking demand would occur on Friday evenings and that the parking supply on the Lorig property would be insufficient at that time.

Mr. Noguchi then walked the Group through the method that was used to estimate parking demand. He explained that his team had considered a 24-hour cycle and had analyzed parking demand for weekdays (Monday – Thursday), Fridays, and Saturdays. He said Sundays were not considered because parking demand is typically very low. Estimates were compiled for the parking demand from condominium owners, apartment residents, and people using retail or office space, restaurants, the cinema, and the park and ride.

Discussion

Mr. Harrison noted that the method of analysis for parking was similar to the one used for traffic, the major difference being that a much higher number of parking spaces was now planned. He said that the Group was dealing with transparency issues, parking issues, and traffic issues. He reminded the Stakeholders that they could choose to enter into an all-new advice discussion, but that the expectation was for them to continue to flag issues of special concern.

Mr. Harrison remarked that the proposal to site a three-minute loading zone on the street for ERA Care was, in part, a response to previous Stakeholder requests that curb cuts be minimized. Mr. Reibman added that he had mentioned the three-minute limit only because it was what had come to mind when he thought about short-term loading. He said that no decision had been made on that matter. Ms. Casseday elaborated that the loading zone decision would be made based on application, preferences identified, the kind of uses that need to be and could be managed on-site, and whether big vehicles could be moved off the street and into the property. She said that longer-term loading might be permitted, depending on the demand for curb space.

Comment: I just want to say thank you (to Mr. Reibman) for working hard to get rid of the curb cuts, and I'm sorry you got blasted for the three-minute loading zone when you were trying to fix the curb cuts.

Response (Jeff Reibman): I just want to clarify that we're talking about two different loading zones: one for people and one on 5th Ave. NE for goods, that's part of the flexibility. We don't necessarily have to have both, so we can keep working on approaches to that problem.

Response (David Harrison): I think we'll ask you and Katherine [Casseday] both to come back during the summer to tell us what is happening with this matter.

Clarification (Ron Lafayette): Was your thinking that when people are moving in or out of the facility they would use the three-minute loading zone?

Response (Jeff Reibman): No, that would be in the truck loading zone that would be shared with our delivery needs. They would schedule a time to use that space.

Question: It seems like there is a new curb cut on 3rd Ave. NE going into the Metro/King County site. Is that the case?

Response (Ron Posthuma): We assumed it was there, but it wasn't so we had to build a new driveway.

Comment: There would be conflicts if there are layover buses laying there, people trying to see to pull out of that driveway, and pedestrians. That's another complication.

Response (Ron Posthuma): You're right. Having the driveway there limits what we can do in terms of parking. We've assumed that there is only space for three buses to lay over with that driveway.

Question: So we would assume that there is space between where the buses actually are and the driveway, so people can see? What are the rules for space between parked buses and curb cuts?

Response (Katherine Casseday): As we look through the design, we consider the pedestrian crossing distances, the curb bulbs that need be an element of the design, and the planned level of control. At the four-way intersection connecting the park and ride to the Lorig property, a four way stop is proposed, which helps reduce the level of risk due to limited site distance.

Question: On one of the slides showing parking demand for the cinema I didn't see any consideration of the people who come home on the bus and don't take their cars away because they may want to go to the movies or the mall.

Response (Tom Noguchi): We made an adjustment for those people. We assumed that it would not be a lot of people. To be conservative in the traffic study, we assumed that most people would leave, which would result in more traffic.

Question: Are you overstating trip generation from the apartments and condos, since the idea is that they could take public transit?

Response (Tom Noguchi): We used a conservative estimate. We think people will be attracted to the project because of the proximity to the transit center, so there would be less parking demand for cars. But, we don't have a similar existing development in the area so we don't know for sure.

Question: It seems you've used very conservative adjustment factors, and, yes, you are probably overstating traffic impacts. But are you, therefore, understating parking impacts? If cars in the park and ride lot stay put, will there be enough parking for theater-goers?

Response (Tom Noguchi): We tried to accommodate those things.

Question: The parking assumptions seem incomplete. Did you consider the possibility that parking demand at the park and ride lot will increase in the future?

Response (Ron Posthuma): We are considering the current proposed level of shared stalls because we don't need them. If it weren't for the movement of the 5th Ave. NE and NE 112th St. parking lot down to be near the transit center, so that we can actually close that lot, we wouldn't be talking about up to 400 shared stalls at the transit center. We're still talking to Simon about the possibility of shared use space in their garage. Between the two, we're pretty sure we'll have enough additional park and ride space near the transit center to let us move down. That's one of the reasons we've been focusing on the bus layover because we also have to move that down.

Comment: This development looks great, but I have a business on the west side of the freeway, and the bad traffic is making it difficult to be in that location. There a big building going up at the corner of Northgate Way and Meridian. Some businesses have vans that they use to transport people from the Northgate Mall parking lot. The

traffic that would be involved with the Lorig development is frightening. I hope and pray that you know what you're doing and that you can change the signals to accommodate 900 trips per hour. I don't want my clients to stay away because of bad traffic. I'm relying on the experts to understand how bad traffic on Northgate Way really is.

Response (David Harrison): Katherine Casseday has agreed to return this summer to continue to follow up on these specific issues.

Comment (Ron Posthuma): We have some of the same concerns because 800 of our buses travel through there, and it's expensive when there's added delay. I hope the signals are re-timed, but I know that signal re-timing, unless you automate the signals, which is an expense, isn't necessarily maintained. I'm wondering if that's a sustainable improvement unless there's a capital investment in upgraded signal technology.

Response (Tom Noguchi): CTIP will consider the issue of the capital cost. We will also look at Northgate Way as a system of signals, not just independent signals, to run traffic more efficiently. We're also looking at moving buses faster and closing some of the left turn options. We have found that there are many accidents on Northgate Way from Meridian to Roosevelt, and we need to think about how to make it a safer corridor.

Comment/Question: One slide showed parking demand for over 1000 cars on Friday nights, but there will only be 900 spaces. Where do the extra 100 cars go?

Response (Tom Noguchi): That is during the peak, between 6 pm and 8 pm, and there should probably be enough room at the transit center. There is also street parking available. So, we think there will be plenty of parking available.

Question: I know people in the Maple Leaf neighborhood worry about people parking in their neighborhood. On the Lorig design, it looked like you have some ground-level parking now?

Response (Richard Loo): The exposed surface parking is the same as before, about 60 – 80 stalls. We now have more underground parking.

Comment: For the shared parking, it looked like about 100 shared use parking spaces would be needed at peak times, but the text says between 200 and 300.

Response (Tom Noguchi): No, it should be 100.

Comment (Ron Posthuma): Just so people understand, it's relatively easy to share parking spaces now, but when we have development on top of the transit center, there will be fewer spaces to share.

Comment (David Harrison): So, we'll assume a range of 100 spaces.

Mr. Harrison then asked Mr. Bollinger to follow up on the parking question and to announce the upcoming steps. Mr. Bollinger noted that the parking and traffic issues were perhaps more complicated than they had been before. With the inclusion of a cinema, the number of planned parking spaces on-site was now about equal to those required by code, but that the shared uses complicated things. He said he thought that there would be more than enough parking, but that Mr. Noguchi preferred to be conservative in his analysis.

Mr. Bollinger said that Lorig would continue to inform the Stakeholders of the project's progress, recalling that he had recently spoken informally with some of the Stakeholders, and noting that, after today's update, Lorig would meet with the Stakeholders again after May 16. He said that there would be another Design Review Board meeting on May 2 to which the public was welcome. He predicted that the only new material the Stakeholders would not have seen would be a few graphics.

Mr. Harrison said it was anticipated that the Group would be formally represented at the Design Review Board meeting. He said that all issues would be retained that had been part of the discussion for summer review, including the loading zone at the ERA Care entrance, the impact of and investment for signalization, overall parking capacity, the implication of capacity at peak times, the connection between Lorig parking and transit center parking, the accuracy of estimates, what to do if the estimates turn out to be less desirable than anticipated, and the CTIP issue - the impact of all of the issues listed on traffic movement around the region.

Themes from Calls with Stakeholders and Future Group Work and Schedule

The Chair called on Ms. Shorett to discuss the key themes that had emerged from telephone conversations with the Stakeholders and to touch on the Group's future work and schedule. Ms. Shorett referred the Group to handouts covering those topics.

Ms. Shorett explained that 18 Stakeholders had been interviewed and that only a few people had not responded, which was a good turnout. She said the most common theme was that people felt the Group had been a good, productive way to provide input to the City government and developers. People felt that they had positively impacted the development plans.

Another common theme was that the Group process had taken a lot of time and personal effort. Ms. Shorett related that at least one Stakeholder had used vacation time to attend the meetings. The one criticism that people had was that they wanted more time for Group discussion and debate of the issues, as opposed to presentations.

In general, people thought the process for drafting and finalizing advice had gone well, although people felt they had been rushed at the last meeting with the late changes that came in from Lorig. Stakeholders really liked the work of the subcommittees as a way to address very detailed issues and bring the results back to the Group.

There were many compliments for City staff for providing information and being willing to make changes based on Group input.

In terms of future work, most people said that the Group had accomplished its mission, with the exception of CTIP. A few people still felt there was work to do on the bigger picture.

Question: Does the Group's scope include working on potential development north of Northgate Way, and, if not, should it?

Response (Alice Shorett): The scope includes large lots.

Comment: The park and ride lot north was to become some sort of public use, a recreation center or park or something, and I think Mullally was to have a big development that would impact traffic. I'd like to see that addressed in the future.

Comment: At the last meeting, Jim Potter talked about the urban centers model code. It was awkward the way it was presented in the public comment period, but this is being discussed all over the place. Maybe that could be a topic of discussion, especially as it ties in to how the City Council is thinking of expanding the geographic scope of the Northgate urban center. It might be interesting to look at a more integrated approach across the counties.

Several people concurred on the desirability of discussing the urban centers model code. Mr. Harrison suggested inviting Jim Potter back in the summer.

Comment: Maybe we would also want some of the other people from other urban areas that he's been working with, so it's not just him and his perceived interest. It could be useful to share efforts.

Comment: That's a great idea. What about including the Puget Sound Regional Council agenda, connected with that.

Response (Ron Lafayette): Do you want this Group to know more about the prosperity partnership?

Comment: Yes, it seems like it goes hand in hand and impacts all of us.

Response (Ron Lafayette): It's about job development focused on five economic clusters.

Response (David Harrison): I would suggest doing a handout about that, since it's not geographically focused, so we can spend our time on the urban centers model code.

Comment: The Group was effective when we represented a broad range of opinions, but clearly enthusiasm has waned. There has been limited attendance at the last few meetings, and I don't see that changing in the future. I question if the Group can be effective going forward due to the lack of interest.

Response (Alice Shorett): This particular meeting was called at the last minute.

Comment: Also, the sustainability workshop at City Hall is tonight.

Response (David Harrison): This was a test, but when we do meetings only quarterly, attendance will go up.

Comment: I agree that the Group got burned out, but now I think meeting quarterly is sustainable.

Comment: In my interview, I said that we should show appreciation for the City staff. They work all day and then they come here. They should be recognized for going that extra step. As taxpayers, we need to recognize our public servants.

Comment: We also need to consider the expense of holding these meetings. We reduced the number of consultants that come to the meetings, but it costs Lorig money every meeting. It's easy to forget that there is a fair amount of cost putting on these meetings. Maybe we need to analyze that. I question whether there's enough general

enthusiasm to keep going. I don't have an agenda. I just want to know if we can still be effective.

Comment: I think this has been an extremely positive and useful effort, even though it was stressful at times and a big time commitment. This was an extra meeting. We've had four meetings in the last month, which is hard for people to do. Several of the people not present tonight are still dedicated. We still have to cover what is happening on the mall site. We received a booklet but there was very little discussion, and the mall was the reason this whole discussion was started five years ago. After all of the bumps in the road, I think this process has been well worth it.

Comment: Historically, you're right, but I'm looking at going forward.

Response (Ron Lafayette): The point about whether to continue meeting is well taken. The City still wants input so the question is how to do that. Continuing with this Group is probably the best option. Maybe we need to help our colleagues to come.

Comment: I propose that if the attendance at our upcoming July meeting is low, like today, we assume that interest is waning.

Response (Tony Mazzella): I don't want to underestimate the amount of hard work you've done. As someone who has worked with you on CTIP and will continue to work with you, we've found your input extraordinarily valuable and we think that we'll have additional products that will galvanize your interest through the rest of the year. As a City project manager who has benefited from your enthusiasm, participation, and serious efforts, I can only say that we really look forward to continuing with you on CTIP to make it as good a plan as we can.

Question (David Harrison): If this Group ended, you would have to do a different public process, right?

Response (Tony Mazzella): The fact that this was a pre-existing, diverse Group ready to work with us was invaluable because, I know we're talking about expense, it saved us the necessity of creating some version of this Group that never would have been as comprehensive. We would need to meet what we felt were public involvement requirements of CTIP.

Response (Ron Lafayette): I appreciate questions about the need for the Group, but we want to move ahead. We have upcoming meetings on July 12, October 13, and January 10, and my sense is that given the alternatives, this is the way we'll go.

Comment: I suggest that we not hold a meeting in July or August because summers are difficult. Maybe we could do meetings in June and September.

Response (Ron Lafayette): How does that relate to decision-making processes?

Response (Tony Mazzella): Aside from subcommittee work, which I assume will continue, we were hoping to end the summer, maybe with that July meeting, with some anticipation of the future conditions and also with the preliminary ideas for improvements that we had come up with. Then, when we come back in September, we could drill down on the project list that is the cornerstone of CTIP. So, the idea of having at least one Group meeting between now and that break in August is important to me.

Comment (Ron Posthuma): On the design of NE 103rd St., we would definitely want to have some input in June or July. I missed the earlier discussion on that today, but we do want to come forward with some actual drawings of that new street.

Response (Ron Lafayette): So it looks like we need to have at least one meeting around that time.

Comment: If we have a summer meeting, I hope that we wouldn't base decisions about the future of the Group on the attendance. We could do a poll to see if people are able to come.

Response (Ron Lafayette): To summarize, we will find a date, see who can come, and find out if that should be a short-term or a long-term decision.

Mr. Harrison asked the nine people still present at the meeting if they could attend a meeting on July 12. A Stakeholder asked that the question be emailed to the entire Stakeholder Group. The Chair agreed.

Ms. Shorett noted that there was a community forum scheduled for June 7 at NSCC for the public to learn about the Lorig project, the Thornton Creek channel, streetscape issues, and news about Simon. She said that community forums were supposed to be conducted quarterly to update the broader public. A Stakeholder commented that the date seemed early enough to avoid people's summer vacations.

The Chair noted that no one had signed up for public comment and adjourned the meeting at 6:25 pm.

Meeting Attendance

Representatives and Alternates of the **Northgate Stakeholders Group** in attendance were:

Metro/King County: Ron Posthuma

Simon Property Group: Rep. Gary Weber

Haller Lake Community Club: Rep. Velva Maye

Victory Heights Community Council: Rep. Brad Cummings

Northgate Chamber of Commerce: Rep. Shaiza Damji

Thornton Creek Alliance: Alt. Cheryl Klinker, Alt. Erik Davido

Thornton Creek Legal Defense: Rep. Janet Way

Northgate Chamber of Commerce: Rep. Shaiza Damji

North Seattle Community College: Rep. Ron LaFayette, Alt. Bruce Kieser

Northwest Hospital: Rose Dammrose

Owners of Three or More Acres: Rep. Kevin Wallace

Senior Housing: Alt. Sandra Morgan

Multi-Family Housing Developers: Colleen Mills

Businesses Outside the Mall: Rep. Michelle Rupp

At-large: Rep. Shawn Oleson

Members of the Triangle Associates facilitation team included Alice Shorett, David Harrison and Ellen Blair.